

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/613,887	Hogan	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
		1655	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) David Casimir

(3) Lisa Arthur

(2) Kirk Hogan

(4) Jeanine Goldberg

Date of Interview: July 30, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: _____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

The examiner's suggested changing the preamble to be more specifically directed to methods of determining risk based upon known markers w/known outcomes. also defining the perioperative time frame to scheduled surgery.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

J. Goldberg
Examiner's signature, if required